

OLYMPIC COAST NATIONAL MARINE SANCTUARY

Meeting Notes

Sanctuary Advisory Council Meeting
July 16, 2010
Quileute Tribal Center
La Push, WA

Olympic Coast National Marine Sanctuary
NOAA, Office of National Marine Sanctuaries
115 E. Railroad Avenue, Suite 301
Port Angeles, WA 98362-2925
FAX # 360-457-8496

Reviewed by SAC Secretary

Reviewed by OCNMS Superintendent



Approved by SAC



Advisory Council (AC) Members in Attendance: *Chip Boothe, Jennifer Hagen, Rebecca Post, Kathy Greer (filling in for Jody Kennedy), George Hart, Joe Gilbertson, Kevin Ryan, Kevin Duffy, Fayette Krause, David Price, Brady Scott, Steve Joner, Frank Holmes, Phil Johnson, Diane Butorac, Ellen Matheny, Roy Morris*

OCNMS Staff in Attendance: *Carol Bernthal, George Galasso, Lauren Bennett, Liam Antrim, Nancy Wright*

Office of National Marine Sanctuaries Staff in Attendance: *Dan Basta (Director), Paul Orlando (Chief of Staff for Strategic Planning), Karen Brubeck (National Sanctuary Advisory Council Coordinator)*

Presenters: *Dr. Jan Newton (University of Washington), Timi Vann (NOAA)*

Members of the Public in Attendance: *Earla Penn, Beverly Loudon, Brittany Bellack, Amy Grondin, Lauren Garske, John Veentjer, Amanda Murphy*

ACTION ITEMS:

- Work on getting a portable CODAR unit in the Sanctuary
- Re-send to the AC Dan's "Our Challenge" essay to the AC
- Re-send to the AC NOAA's fisheries wiring diagram and a copy of the AC's 2006 letter commenting on a draft of the fisheries wiring diagram.
- Ask ONMS Conservation Director John Armor to look into any differences between how the Capps bill and the current NMSA address regulating fisheries under the NMSA.
- Form AC working group to draft NMSA reauthorization letter
- Forward the letter that the AC is planning to draft related to NMSA reauthorization to the Jefferson County Commissioners.
- Send Amy Grondin's contact information to the AC
- Make sure AC members are put on the Sanctuary Watch mailing list
- Send the AC an electronic copy of the prospectus on the climate change and indigenous coastal cultures workshop
- Send the AC a link to the ONMS West Coast Region quarterly AC report
- Send the AC an email with the Superintendent's Report
- (carryover from last meeting) OCNMS will find out whether there are any parts of the MPR/NEPA process at which OCNMS is restricted from sharing ex-parte information with the AC.
- (carryover from last meeting) OCNMS will investigate if the NEPA document would/could be a programmatic document and if OCNMS will integrate its compliance with other federal laws (Endangered Species Act) into the NEPA document.

FUTURE AGENDA TOPICS:

- Canadian-bound shipping cost-sharing for the industry managed Emergency Response Towing vessel at Neah Bay.
- Tom Eaton, the EPA Region 10 head of Washington Operations. Lauren will solicit help from AC members to brief Tom on the types of questions he is likely to get from the AC.
- Gulf of the Farallones National Marine Sanctuary presentation on implementing ONMS's Climate Smart Sanctuaries Program.
- Update on ONMS West Coast Region's work responding to the ocean acidification (OA) resolutions passed by the ACs last year.
- Sustainable Fisheries Partnership ocean acidification efforts
- Planning for the OCNMS data management workshop

- Report out from the working group drafting the NMSA reauthorization letter
- MPR update
- Joint AC-IPC meeting in November
- Department of Ecology presentation on how cultural resources are protected during spill responses

DISCUSSION SUMMARY:

Welcome and Announcements

Bill Peach, Executive Director of the Quileute Tribe, welcomed the AC to La Push and let everyone know about Quileute Days events, which were starting that afternoon. Bill then introduced Quileute elder Beverly Loudon, who also welcomed the AC to La Push. Anna Rose Counsell-Geyer, Quileute Chairwoman, welcomed the group later in the day. She said it was a great honor to have the AC meet in La Push and invited everyone to stay for Quileute Days.

Ellen Matheny asked to make an announcement. She let the group know that, her neighbor and fellow AC member, Mel Moon, had just had surgery to remove cancer. She said that Mel was doing well and that the surgery had been a great success.

Chip Boothe took a moment to mention the U.S. Coast Guard helicopter that crashed off the coast of the La Push and the servicemen who lost their lives in the crash. He asked that AC members keep those who go out to sea in their prayers. He mentioned that there will be a memorial ceremony in La Push on Monday. Steve Joner mentioned that his son (in Sitka) supervised the men who died. Steve said that folks in Sitka are very grateful for everything that the community in La Push did to help in the rescue and response efforts.

Agenda and Last Meeting's Notes

Brady Scott moved to adopt agenda; Jennifer Hagen seconded this motion. The meeting agenda was adopted unanimously with no changes.

Chip asked if there were any changes to the draft May meeting notes that were distributed. Rebecca Post moved to adopt the minutes; Jennifer Hagen seconded the motion. The May meeting notes were adopted unanimously.

Office of National Marine Sanctuaries (ONMS) Response to Data Management Resolution

Carol passed out hard copies of Dan Basta's (ONMS Director) response to the data management letter that the AC sent to him in May. Lauren noted that the response letter will be posted on the AC website. Carol summarized the response letter. ONMS would like to work with OCNMS to develop a data management plan that addresses OCNMS's data management needs. There would be opportunities in this data management plan for regional data management efforts and some centralized efforts. In order to develop the data management plan, over the coming year ONMS proposes to work with the AC to host an OCNMS data workshop with OCNMS data users. Carol pointed out that developing a data management plan is a strategy in the OCNMS Draft Management Plan. Once a data management plan is developed, resources to implement it would be sought. Additionally, ONMS noted the AC's interest in using sanctuaries as sentinel sites for climate change monitoring and the data management needs that would be associated with such a monitoring effort. ONMS is planning a sentinel site workshop for the entire sanctuary program and would like to invite an OCNMS AC rep to participate in this effort (tentatively later this fall).

Dan followed up on Carol's remarks. He emphasized that, while the ONMS's response of planning a workshop may seem bureaucratic, but that is not the intent. ONMS is proposing a very involved workshop – the intent is not to plan for the next plan for the next plan. The workshop will require a lot of up-front work to understand OCNMS data needs and the post-process synthesis that is needed. The workshop will require a lot of AC member effort. The workshop would be a minimum of a 2 – 2.5 day effort. In terms of the sentinel site workshop, ONMS has formed a working group that is planning the workshop. The oil spill in the Gulf of Mexico has detracted from planning efforts because so many ONMS staff are deployed to the Gulf. Thus, the sentinel site workshop, while planned for this fall, might not happen within that time frame. Carol will keep the AC posted. Chip thanked Dan for his quick response to the AC's data management letter. An AC member mentioned that the University of Washington Olympic Natural Resources Center (ONRC) has a lot of experience managing a marine data clearinghouse and asked that ONRC be kept in mind during the planning process. Another AC member asked if a steering committee would be formed to plan the OCNMS workshop and Carol responded that there would.

Presentation: Murdock Ocean Observing Array deployment

Chip introduced Dr. Jan Newton (University of Washington) and Timi Vann (NOAA). Dr. Newton explained that she was at the AC meeting to present on Washington's newest buoy, which was being deployed that day. The buoy is part of the IOOS-NANOOS network (IOOS stands for Integrated Ocean Observing System and NANOOS stands for Northwest Association of Ocean Observing Systems). NOAA is the leading agency for IOOS, which, in turn, is implemented regionally (i.e., NANOOS). There are 11 regional associations (e.g., NANOOS) in the U.S. NANOOS has a governing council with industry, tribal governments, NGOs, academic, state, local and federal government representatives. NANOOS's priority areas are:

- Maritime Operations (safety, transport etc.)
- Ecosystem Impacts
- Fisheries
- Mitigating coastal hazards,
- Climate including OA

Within these priority areas, NANOOS focuses on mapping currents, deploying and managing moorings (shelf), developing shoreline change models and circulation models, and conducting education and outreach.

The scientific value of the Murdock array is great. The Outer Coast has hypoxic issues that aren't well understood. There is a harmful algal bloom "hot spot" on the Outer Coast. And the Outer Coast is being impacted by ocean acidification as well. The accuracy of current climate change models for the Outer Coast is limited by lack of ground-truthed data.

This is not just a single buoy – it is an observing array with three major components. The first component is a buoy fixed to the seafloor it will monitor parameters such as wind direction, wind speed, air temperature, humidity, carbon dioxide, water temperature, salinity, pH, nutrients, and chlorophyll. OCNMS donated a current profiler that is now affixed to the buoy. Data from the buoy can be telemetered to the shore (via the La Push U.S. Coast Guard station). The second component is a buoy that has a moving piece that makes measurements along the water column (below surface waters because winter water would damage the equipment). The third component is a sea glider (an unmanned autonomous or remotely operated vehicle); it glides through water without an engine (has

batteries and its buoyancy can be adjusted remotely). The glider can come up to surface and relay data collected. Researchers will have the glider undulate on a fixed pattern, but if there is something interesting happening somewhere else, researchers can re-program the glider and change its course. The glider can go for months without new batteries or maintenance.

This is the most sophisticated array to be deployed off of the coast of Washington. The type of buoy used in the Murdock array has been field tested in the Gulf of Maine so researchers hope that the Murdock buoy will hold up in the rough winter conditions on the Outer Coast. Carol mentioned that OCNMS has seasonal buoys in the near shore and that OCNMS has been discussing with Dr. Newton how OCNMS data could be streamed through the NANOOS portal to try and get our information out.

The data from the array will be available on the NANOOS visualization system (on-line), which is run through Google Earth. NANOOS even has an iPhone application to view data from the site. And the NANOOS data streaming/downloading feature is free. Carol suggested thinking about ways OCNMS could work with NANOOS to build an education program for Outer Coast communities focused on the Murdock array. NANOOS has two education specialists working on curricula for the outer coast communities.

Timi Vann spoke on behalf of John Stein (Director of the Northwest Fisheries Science Center). John has been deployed to the Gulf of Mexico and thus could not attend the AC meeting. Timi spoke to the benefits and values of partnerships. Partnerships are the intersection between applications, science and technology. NOAA pursues science that is relevant to society and looks to society to help define its scientific endeavors. She encouraged the AC and IPC to continue to be engaged in defining what NOAA's scientific endeavors (e.g., development of sentinel sites). She said that the real-time data coming off of the Murdock array will have such great applications to management, and she encouraged the AC to stay engaged in this project and look for further opportunities to collaborate.

Murdock Array Questions and Answers

Q: Could the sea glider get picked up by fishing nets?

A: This could happen, but it hasn't happened with any gliders thus far.

Q: At what depth is the array placed?

A: The glider can be sent to most any depth. The two buoys will be at the 100 meter contour. The glider will follow a (50-60 mile) transect across the continental shelf and beyond. The glider moves very slowly – it will take it several days to travel the length of its transect.

Q: How long will the buoy be in place – indefinitely?

A: University of Washington is going to pick the buoy up in October. It will be serviced over the winter (2010-2011) and then deployed again in the spring indefinitely (with routine servicing in the field).

Q: Could the buoy located at the mouth of the Strait of Juan de Fuca be retrofitted to collect data similar to the Murdock array?

A: The Juan de Fuca buoy can't be outfitted exactly like the Murdock buoy, but folks are working to enhance the Juan de Fuca buoy (add sensors etc.).

Q: Does the glider has a pH sensor?

A: The glider does not have a pH sensor (the sensor footprint is too big). She mentioned that the industry is moving toward development of smaller, high accuracy pH sensors.

Q: Are there sensors for toxic contaminants on the buoy?

A: That the array does not have this type of sensor, but such sensors could be added in the future. Current sensors on the array will help to deal with response to an oil spill, should one occur.

Q: Would the buoy help to understand global warming?

A: Yes, there are temperature sensors.

Q: Should Quileute be worried about moving to higher ground as some Native Alaskans have had to do?

A: Not yet.

Q: Does NANOOS interact with Canada?

A: Yes, you can get some Canadian data through NANOOS. NANOOS is also working to do more data/information exchanges with European ocean observing systems. International coordination happens slowly but it is very important.

Q: Are there any monitoring buoys in the Arctic?

A: Yes, these monitoring efforts are managed by the Alaska Ocean Observing System

Q: Is it that ocean acidification models for the Outer Coast have been developed but not finished due to lack of ground-truthed data? Or is it that ocean acidification models have not even been created yet?

A: The answer is yes and no. There are some physical models developed and researchers are just waiting for data. However, carbon has not yet been built into those models, so to some extent the models need to be developed.

Q: What does future funding for IOOS look like?

A: The funding outlook isn't great. There are extreme budget constraints that are not expected to change in the near future. That is why there is a real need to partner. Timi emphasized to the AC that folks on Capitol Hill are more receptive and responsive to requests that come from outside of NOAA, rather than from within NOAA.

Q: What was the cost of buoys?

A: The total cost was \$700K (including operational costs). \$500K came from the Murdock Charitable Trust and \$200K from the University of Washington.

Q: Is there an ideal number of buoys for this region?

A: If we could have four more buoys that would be good. But HF (high frequency) radar and gliders are also necessary. Dan Basta mentioned that NOAA has portable CODAR units and will try to get one deployed on the Outer Coast. He suggested collaborating with NANOOS to get NOAA COOPS.

Update on National Marine Sanctuaries Act (NMSA) Reauthorization Listening Session

Chip attended the NMSA listening session held by Rep. Capps (D-CA) on May 24 and e-mailed his notes (attached) to the AC. Rep. Capps' office is still assimilating information they received in listening sessions. The listening session with the Advisory Council chairs was the first listening session held. Rep. Capps' office was also going to reach out to fishermen and tribes. On the call, Chip (speaking as an individual and not representing the entire AC) said he echoed the importance of reaching out to those two groups, particularly in our region and recommended that Rep. Capps' office approach the Coastal Treaty Tribes, individually and through the Olympic Coast Intergovernmental Policy Council (IPC). Chip

also recommended holding a field hearing on the Outer Coast. He noted that Rep. Capps' office did share a working draft of the NMSA legislation her office developed before the call, but her office asked that the listening session participants not share the document because it was an early working document. The key themes that arose during the listening session were:

- The importance of the NMSA as validating sanctuaries as national assets.
- The importance of treaty trust responsibility, Usual & Accustomed Areas, and the cultural aspects of sanctuary involvement with tribes and other indigenous peoples.
- The importance of sustainable fisheries and the fact that fishing is an important part of life on the coast.

AC members then discussed the NMSA reauthorization issue. Tribal representatives said that Rep. Capps' office did hold follow-up listening sessions to which the tribes were specifically invited. Several tribal representatives attended various listening sessions. One aspect that bothered tribal representatives during these listening sessions was that a representative from one of the California sanctuaries said that sanctuary priorities go beyond sustainable fisheries and that sanctuaries' interests must move toward intact ecosystems. This statement really concerned tribes. If an intact ecosystem means no fishing then that's a problem. Another tribal representative indicated that she was disappointed in the Capps' NMSA version that she saw. She feels it is anti-fishing in its current form and that the economic importance of fisheries is not emphasized. She noted that the fishing industry, with the exception of tribal representatives, wasn't included in the calls, and that there were many NGOs on the call. However, she was glad that Rep. Capps held the listening sessions and hopes that the next version of the bill is better as a result.

Dan Basta emphasized the importance of reauthorizing the NMSA. He said that sanctuaries are a validation of community integration in and investment in places. Reauthorization is four years overdue. The Office of National Marine Sanctuaries (ONMS) cares about several aspects of the Capps version of the NMSA. The Capps version would:

- reestablish the relevance of sanctuaries
- remove the prohibition on adding sanctuaries
- highlight maritime heritage and direct funding toward cultural efforts

Dan suggested that no version of the Act would ever be perfect, but that perfect should not be the enemy of good. He said it was uncertain whether the Capps NMSA bill would get introduced or whether Congress would take the bill up if it was introduced. Dan emphasized the importance of the sanctuary advisory council voices in the reauthorization process and suggested that if AC members feel NMSA reauthorization should be a bigger priority for NOAA, the agency hearing that from the outside would be helpful. An AC member asked if the ONMS has an official position on the Capps' version of the NMSA. Dan said that the ONMS does not have an official position. One aspect of the Capps bill that ONMS disagrees with is a provision to form a national steering committee for the sanctuary program. ONMS believes that that function is already served by the sanctuary advisory councils. An AC member asked if the OCNMS AC charter could be strengthened so that AC chairs cannot be dismissed. Karen Brubeck (ONMS AC Coordinator) said that there is a generic provision for removing AC members (not just chairs) in AC charters, but it has never been used at any sanctuary. The intention of this provision was to address extreme cases (e.g., situations in which a member was convicted of a crime). The OCNMS AC could look at this provision when it reviews its charter.

Carol spoke a little bit about what NMSA reauthorization means at home for OCNMS and the OCNMS AC. Having a reauthorized act puts an emphasis on processes like the management plan review. An authorized act will empower OCNMS to do the work we've just outlined in the draft management plan. Dan emphasized that reauthorization would also provide an increased ceiling for funding (though an increased funding ceiling does not necessarily mean funding will increase). The ONMS has been level-funded for almost six years.

Fayette Krause made a motion that the AC send a letter to Dr. Jane Lubchenco stating that reauthorization should be a priority. Rebecca Post seconded the motion and then the AC discussed the issue. There was concern about what the letter would say and if it would/should reference or endorse any aspects of the Capps' bill (several members stated they could not support the current version of the Capps bill). It became apparent that there was confusion about whether the current version of the Capps' bill (which only a few AC members had seen) changed the way fisheries could be regulated under the NMSA. The ONMS representatives said it was their understanding that the Capps bill would not alter the existing process by which fisheries could be regulated under the NMSA. It was agreed that Lauren would re-send to the AC NOAA's fisheries wiring diagram that explains how fisheries can be regulated under the NMSA and Magnuson-Stevens Act. Lauren would also send the AC a copy of its own 2006 letter commenting on a draft of the NOAA fisheries wiring diagram. Carol said that she would ask ONMS Conservation Director, John Armor, to review this issue. After additional and lengthy discussion, Chip Boothe made a friendly amendment to Fayette's motion: establish a working group to 1) draft a resolution to support NOAA making reauthorization a priority, and 2) draft a letter to the Secretary of Commerce, presuming that the Capps bill isn't introduced in August, supporting reauthorization of the NMSA as a priority for the Department of Commerce and NOAA. If the Capps' bill is introduced this August, the AC could shift its focus to analyzing and understanding that bill. Brady Scott made a motion to accept Chip's friendly amendment and Steve Joner seconded the motion. Fayette accepted the friendly amendment. The AC voted unanimously in favor of the motion. Chip asked for volunteers for the working group. Fayette Krause, Steve Joner, Jennifer Hagen, Ellen Matheny and Rebecca Post all volunteered.

Phil Johnson said that, if the AC forwarded its letter to the Secretary of Commerce to the Jefferson County Commissioners, they would take it up at one of their future meetings and discuss sending the same letter to the Secretary.

Presentation: Sustainable Fisheries Partnership Ocean Acidification

Amy Grondin with the Sustainable Fisheries Partnership (SFP) gave a brief presentation on SFP's current ocean acidification outreach efforts. She has been working with SFP for the past six months and working with commercial shellfish harvesters who will be the first to see the impacts of ocean acidification. SFP is trying to get information about ocean acidification to fishermen and help them engage with policy makers. SFP is interested in combining efforts with the sanctuary related to ocean acidification. Brad Warren from SFP will have a more formal presentation for the AC at its September meeting. In December 2009, SFP brought fishermen from all over the nation to Capitol Hill and were well-received. They were invited back to do a briefing with 45 staffers from the Hill. Sen. Cantwell then held a hearing on ocean acidification. SFP is also working with the Port Townsend Marine Science Center, Beachwatchers and OCNMS to hold a workshop on ocean acidification on October 7. More details will follow. SFP is also working with the Northwest Indian Fisheries Commission to put together a workshop with tribes in Washington on how ocean acidification may affect treaty resources.

Carol said that OCNMS would pass along the October workshop invitation to the AC and ask that AC members forward the invitation to their constituencies. Dan asked Amy what the SFP's "ask" is on Capitol Hill. Amy said that they asked for carbon caps and money for monitoring and research. Phil Johnson suggested that SFP send information about its ocean acidification efforts to the Hood Canal Coordinating Council. Steve Joner mentioned that he saw John Stein give a great presentation on ocean acidification and noted that Dr. Stein could be a great resource for the AC on this topic.

Director Dan Basta Update

Dan discussed two major issues with the AC:

1) How to avoid "post-partum" Management Plan Review depression

MPR is such a difficult, time-consuming process that, once the document gets drafted, inertia can set in. There can be long delays in NOAA's clearance process. During these long delays, ONMS often can't provide updates. In the past this has led to a loss of trust between the sanctuaries and their ACs. To avoid the post-management plan drafting lull, it is important to start thinking about things the AC is going to get engaged in to implement management plan (and what the AC's role will be in implementing the management plan). Dan asked the AC not to wait for the draft management plan to be made final before starting to implement it. If funds allow, the ONMS is planning to give AC coordinators a mini-grant fund, so that ACs can submit proposals for projects they need to do as a body or sub-group.

2) Climate change and indigenous coastal cultures workshop

Dan passed out hardcopies of a draft prospectus that ONMS has worked on with the IPC for a climate change and indigenous cultures workshop. The workshop will be a major event, intended to bring indigenous peoples to Washington D.C. The workshop will be a week and will be held at the Smithsonian's National Museum of the American Indian. The IPC is ONMS's number one partner in planning this workshop. Dan said that the Pacific Northwest has a unique voice in this discussion, though indigenous cultures from all over the country will be involved with the workshop. ONMS is waiting to get a "thumbs up" from the Coastal Treaty Tribes on this prospectus (by September) and then Billy Frank, Northwest Fisheries Commission, and Dan are going to take the next step of going to the head of the Smithsonian Museum to ask that they host the workshop. A series of working groups have been identified to plan the workshop. Some of the workshop funding will come from ONMS but outside sponsors need to be found. Dan said that indigenous voices can tell the story of climate change in a different way – in a way that resonates with people. He said this workshop is about sending a message that investing in coastal communities is investing in all of us. He said that ONMS would continue to keep the OCNMS AC in the loop as workshop planning moves forward. One AC member asked when the workshop was envisioned to be held. Dan said the goal is within 18 months, but that could change.

Dan also let the AC know about the upcoming Blue Ocean Film Festival in Monterey (<http://www.blueoceanfilmfestival.org/>) and encouraged AC members to attend.

Public Comment

Earla Penn provided public comment. She asked if the U.S. government limits NOAA's real potential? Carol responded that NOAA has to work within its authorities and budget. Earla asked how big a back up plan OCNMS has for an emergency (a tsunami or spill). Carol responded that lots of agencies work together to develop the many contingency plans that are in place to respond to emergencies. Earla asked if the OCNMS AC accomplished what it came to La Push to accomplish today? Carol responded

that yes, the group had. She mentioned that the AC rotates its location and has a meeting every two months. Earla expressed concern about the use of dispersants in the Gulf of Mexico and stated that she is outraged that the U.S. government is experimenting with the health of our oceans by using dispersants. She asked that everyone in the room join together to stop the government from railroading our environment and stated that she would like to see the Quileute Tribe be able to hunt seals again.

Phil Johnson asked if the tug boat at Neah Bay would be recommissioned to the Gulf of Mexico to support the BP Deepwater Horizon spill response? Carol said that it would not.

Frank Holmes asked to provide a brief update on management of the Neah Bay tug. The state of Washington legislature passed management of the tug to industry (from the Department of Ecology). Industry has been working on setting up a management regime for the tug for the past year. They formed the ERTV (emergency response towing vessel) Compliance Group (non-profit), which includes representatives of the tank vessel and non-tank vessel industries. The cost of funding the tug will be split between the tank vessel and non-tank vessel industry. The Marine Exchange under John Veentjer serves as the fiduciary agent for administering the tug contract on behalf of the ERTV Compliance Group. The Marine Exchange is going to be in charge of billing vessels. Foss Maritime has been hired as the contractor to provide the emergency towing vessel service. The M/V Jeffrey Foss is the ERTV assigned and has been at Neah Bay since the beginning of July 2010. Carol asked if OCNMS would continue to be notified when the tug was called out in the sanctuary. Chip said that the Department of Ecology would continue to be notified of ERTV deployments and would, in turn, continue to notify OCNMS as it has done in the past. An AC member asked how many vessels have enrolled in the tug payment program? John Veentjer said that 300 vessels (making approximately 3,000 transits to or from U.S. ports) have enrolled. Vessels that are 300 tons or greater and bound for a U.S. port through the Strait of Juan de Fuca must be enrolled.. Vessel fees are assessed per roundtrip transit of such vessels. These fees only pay for the tug to remain on standby at Neah Bay, and only vessels calling at U.S. ports currently contribute to the cost of maintaining the tug on standby at Neah Bay. However, the ERTV is available to respond to any disabled vessel. Actual ERTV responses would be funded directly by the owner of the stricken vessel requiring assistance. The US Coast Guard and WA State Department of Ecology may also contract directly for the tug's services, if deemed necessary.

Management Plan Review (MPR) Update

Due to limited time, George shortened his MPR update. He passed out to AC members, 1) an updated MPR process diagram handout and 2) a handout showing the proposed Draft Management Plan (including environmental compliance) outline. He said that OCNMS have been working on drafting the management plan. The action plans are pretty much unchanged. OCNMS staff have worked more on the implementation table and performance measures, but structurally the draft management plan is pretty much the same as the last time the AC saw it in March. OCNMS has a July 23 deadline to get a rough, preliminary draft of the entire management plan and environmental compliance documentation to the IPC. The IPC will then have four weeks to comment. George said that OCNMS accelerated its MPR timeline in this way so that they could get a more final document to the Pacific Fishery Management Council (PFMC) by November. The PFMC sub-committees will start working on its comments in November so that the larger committee can formalize its comments at the March PFMC meeting. George said he would give a more detailed MPR briefing to the AC in September. He said that the plan is for the public comment period on the Draft Management Plan to begin on the day of the January 2011 AC meeting and close on the date of the March AC meeting.

Superintendent's Report

Carol handed out a copy of the most recent ONMS West Coast Regional Office's quarterly Advisory Council report. Lauren will send out a link to the reports web location. Given the shortness of time, Carol said she would email the rest of her Superintendent's Report to the AC.